

# Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland

<http://journals.cambridge.org/JRA>

Additional services for *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

## Art. VI.—Remarks by Raja Radhakanta Deva, on Art. XI, Journal Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. XVI, p. 201;

H. H. Wilson

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland / Volume 17 / January 1860, pp 209 - 220

DOI: 10.1017/S0035869X00094582, Published online: 14 March 2011

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0035869X00094582](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0035869X00094582)

### How to cite this article:

H. H. Wilson (1860). Art. VI.—Remarks by Raja Radhakanta Deva, on Art. XI, Journal Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. XVI, p. 201;. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland, 17, pp 209-220  
doi:10.1017/S0035869X00094582

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

ART. VI.—*Remarks by Raja Radhakanta Deva, on Art. XI, Journal Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. XVI, p. 201; with Observations by Professor H. H. WILSON.*

[*Read 19th March, 1859.*]

THE sixteenth volume of the Journal of our Society, has given insertion to a communication made by me, on the supposed authority of the Vedas, for the burning of Hindu widows, in which I have shown that the passage quoted as enjoining the practice, and as published by Mr. Colebrooke, in his Paper in the Asiatic Researches, upon the "Duties of a Sati or Faithful Widow," had been either purposely or accidentally wrongly read, and that so far from authorizing the rite, its real purport was the reverse; and that it expected the widow to repress her affliction and return to her worldly duties. This view was entirely confirmed by the explanation of the passage given by the celebrated commentator, Sáyana Achárya, and by the precepts of Aswaláyana, cited by Professor Maximilian Müller, published in continuation of my remarks on the same occasion. The revised reading has not proved acceptable to the Pandits of Calcutta, and the following letter is the expression of their sentiments. The writer, a friend of many years, Raja Radhakant Deb is well known as a leading member of the Native Society of Calcutta, who adds to the distinction of rank and station, that of a foremost place amongst Sanskrit scholars, as evinced by his great Lexicon or Literary Encyclopædia of the Sanskrit language, in seven quarto volumes; the Sabdakalpadruma, which enjoys a European as well as Indian celebrity. Any opinion coming from him on subjects connected with the ancient literature of his country is entitled to the greatest deference. The question of the authority for the Sati cremation is now, as he rightly observes, a matter merely for literary discussion, but as it is not without interest for the historian and antiquarian, his remarks will, I doubt not, be highly acceptable to those scholars who are engaged in the investigation of the ancient religion and history of the Hindus; and as he has no objection to their being laid before the public, I have thought it advisable to request a place for them in the Journal, although, as I

shall subsequently explain, they have not induced me to modify in the least my opinions on the subject, as my esteemed correspondent seems to anticipate.

MY DEAR DR. WILSON,

Although the abolition of the practice of Sahamarana in the British Indian territories has legally set the question at rest, and deprived it of all interest in the public eye, yet its discussion will always afford pleasure to the historian and antiquarian, and has its peculiar value in a literary point of view.

The perusal of your very interesting article "On the supposed Vaidic authority for the burning of Hindu Widows, and on the Funeral Ceremonies of the Hindús," which appeared in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, vol. xvi. part i., having induced me to inquire whether any trace of this custom can be found in the Vedas, I have made certain discoveries and come to a conclusion, which I believe, would lead you to modify considerably the opinion you have formed on the subject.

The most explicit authority for the burning of a widow with her deceased husband, is to be found in the two verses of the Aukhya Sákhá of the Taittiríya Sanhitá, quoted in the eighty-fourth Anuváka of the Náráyaniya Upanishad, of which I give the following literal translation, and subjoin<sup>1</sup> the original text with the commentary of Sáyanáchárya :—

<sup>1</sup> Text. अग्ने व्रतानां व्रतपतिरसि पत्यानुगमव्रतं चरिष्यामि  
तच्छकेयं तन्मे राध्यतां ॥ १ ॥ Com. हे अग्ने. कर्षसाचिन् ।  
यतः त्वं व्रतानां प्राजापत्याद्यखिलव्रतानां व्रतपतिरसि ।  
पुनर्व्रतयद्दणं त्वमेव व्रतानामधिपतिर्नान्य इति नियमबो  
धनात् ॥ तस्मान् मया चर्ष्यमाणं यत् सांप्रतिकं व्रतं तद्यद्याहं  
कर्तुं शक्यं तद्याराध्यतां क्रियतामित्यर्थः । धातूनामनेका  
र्थत्वात् । किं त्वया चर्ष्यमाणं तद्भ्रतमिति पत्यानुगमेति पत्या  
भर्त्रा सह अनुसृत्यगमनव्रतं चरिष्यामि करिष्यामीत्यर्थः ॥

1. "Oh! Agni, of all Vratas<sup>1</sup>, thou art the Vratapati<sup>2</sup>, I will observe the vow (Vrata) of following the husband. Do thou enable me to accomplish it!"

2. "Here (in this rite), to thee O Agni, I offer salutation; to gain the heavenly mansion I enter into thee (wherefore), Oh Jataveda<sup>3</sup>; this day, satisfied with the clarified butter (offered by me), inspire me with courage (for Sahagamana) and take me to my lord."

Agreeably to this general Vaidic injunction, the Sutrakáras direct that the widow, like the sacrificial utensils of a Brahmana, should be made to lie upon the funeral pile of her husband, and accordingly as he was a Brahmana, Kshetriya, or Vaisya, a piece of gold, a bow, or a jewel is to be respectively placed thereupon.

To the widow so placed beside the lifeless body of her husband, the Mantras beginning with "... Udirshwa, &c.," and "Savarna goong hastát, &c., Dhanurhastát, &c.," or "Manigoong hastát, &c.," are to be addressed<sup>4</sup> to her by her husband's brother or fellow-student, accordingly as he belonged to the priestly, military, or mercantile class.

Text. इह त्वा अग्ने नमसा विधेय सुवर्गस्य लोकस्य समेत्यै ।  
 जुषाणो अद्य हविषा जातवेदो विशानि त्वा सत्वतो नय मा  
 पत्युरये ॥ Com. हे अग्ने इह अस्मिन् कर्माणि । त्वा त्वामु  
 हिस्म । हविषा हविर्भागेन । नमसा नमस्कारेण च । विधेयं  
 नमो विदधामीत्यर्थः । किमर्थमित्युक्तौ तत्राह । सुवर्गस्येति  
 सुवर्गस्य पतिसंप्राप्यलोकस्य । समेत्यै सम्यक् प्राप्यर्थं । त्वा  
 त्वयीत्यर्थः सप्तम्यर्थं द्वितीया छान्दसी । विशानि प्रविशानि  
 अत एव अद्य अस्मिन् दिने । हे जातवेदः हविषा महत्तेन  
 हविर्भागेण । जुषाणः सन्तुष्टः सन् । सत्वतः सत्वमार्गप्रदर्शनद्वारा  
 सत्वमार्गसिष्यक साहसप्रदानद्वारेति यावत् । मा मां पति  
 मां कर्तुं देवतां पत्युः मम भर्तुरये समञ्चं नय प्रापयेत्यर्थः ॥

<sup>1</sup> Vowed or voluntary observances

<sup>2</sup> Lord of Vratas

<sup>3</sup> Source of the Vedas.

<sup>4</sup> The first part of the address beginning with "Udirshwa," &c., is the same in respect of the funeral of the first three classes: by this Mantra the widow is requested to leave the corpse and to return to her abode. The remaining three Mantras are to be addressed to the widow of a Brahmana, Kshetriya, and Vaisya

If the widow thus addressed has not made up her mind for her immolation, she obeys the call ; but should she be firm in her resolve, she consoles her friends and relatives, and enters the fire.

Extracts<sup>1</sup> from Bharadwája and Aswaláyana, and from the Saha-

respectively, whereby she is required to lift up from the funeral pile the respective symbols of the deceased, and therewith to rub his hands. This call forms an important part of the ceremony.

<sup>1</sup> अथैनं चितावुपर्यधूहत्यत्रैव वा पत्न्याः संवेशना क्रियत इति ॥ Bharadwája's Súra, Prasna 1.

अथैतानि पात्राणि योजयेद्दक्षिणे हस्ते जुहूं सव्य उपभृतं दक्षिणे पार्श्वे स्थं सव्ये अग्निहोत्रहवणीमुरसि ध्रुवां शिरसि कल्पानानीत्यादि Aswaláyana's Grihya Súra, Adhyaya iv. 3.

उत्तरतः पत्नीं ॥ Com. ततः प्रेतस्योत्तरतः पत्नीं संवेशयन्ति । शाययन्तीत्यर्थः । चितावेव उपशेष इति लिङ्गात् । एतावद्दर्पणत्रयस्यापि समानं ॥ Ib. Adh. ii. 3.

उदीर्घ्वनार्यभिजीवलोकं गतासुमेतमुपशेष इति । हस्तग्राभस्य दिधिषोस्तवेदं पत्युर्जनित्वमभिसंबभूथ ॥

हस्तौ सन्मार्ष्टिं सुवर्णेन ब्राह्मणस्य सुवर्णं हस्तादिति । धनुषा राजन्यस्यधनुर्हस्तादिति । मणिना वैश्वस्य मणिं हस्तादिति ॥ Bharadwája's Súra.

तामुत्यापयेद्देवरः पतिस्थानीयोऽन्नेवासी जरहासो वोदीर्घ्वनार्यभिजीवलोकमिति Aswa, ii. 2.

उत्तरतः पत्नीं । तां प्रेतस्योत्तरतः सुप्तां सच्चरहितां देवरः शिष्यो वा करे धृत्वा नमस्कृत्य उदीर्घ्वेति दाभ्यामुत्यापयेत् । सत्त्वाधिकात्तु खयमेव सुहृदः संबन्धिनः पुत्रांश्च समाभ्यंभ्य भर्तारं विष्णुरूपं धृत्वा हुताशनं प्रविशेदित्युक्तं ॥<sup>\*</sup> Sahamaraṇavedhi.

\* Her (the widow) lying on the north of the deceased, if she want courage, her husband's brother, or fellow-student, or old servant shall, by reciting the two

maranavidhi, a work of much repute in Drávida, are quoted below in elucidation of these practices. From these Vaidic and Sautric injunctions have been derived the rules and directions for the immolation of the Sati, in the Smritis and Puránas.

After having thus shown the Vaidic authority for the Sahamarana, I shall offer some observations upon the conclusions you have drawn, on perusing the seventh and eighth Verses<sup>1</sup> of the second Súkta of the second Anuváka of the tenth Mandala of the Rigveda

In the first place, on referring to Raghunandana's *Suddhitattwa*, whence Colebrooke derives his materials for his "Essay on the Duties of a Faithful Widow," published in the fourth volume of the *Asiatic Researches*, we find the author citing a verse<sup>2</sup> from the Rigveda and a passage<sup>3</sup> from the *Brahma Purána*, in order to show that the Veda authorizes Sahamarana. You suppose this verse to be an incorrect reading of the seventh Rich above alluded to, and support your reasoning by the Commentary of Sáyana and the directions of Aswaláyana.

Now, the shortest way in which our pandits would dispute this opinion, would be to assert that for aught that we moderns know, Raghunandana's citation may be altogether a different verse from the seventh Rich, and may be found somewhere, in any of the five Sákhas<sup>4</sup> of the Rigveda ; inasmuch as the same verse, with slight variations of reading, and hence with different import and application, often occurs

<sup>1</sup> इमा नारीरविधवाः सपत्नीराञ्जनेन सर्षिषा संविशन्तु ।  
अनश्रवोऽनमीवाः सुरत्ना रोहन्तु जनयो योनिमये ॥ १ ॥

उदीर्घ्वं नार्थ्यभिजीवलोकं गतासुमेतं उपशेष एहि । हस्तग्रा  
भस्य दिधिषो स्तवेदं पत्युर्जनित्वमभिसंबभूय ॥ ५ ॥

<sup>2</sup> इमा नारीरविधवाः सपत्नीराञ्जनेन सर्षिषा संविशन्तु ।  
अनखरोऽनमीवाः सुरत्ना आरोहन्तु जनयो यो निमये ॥

<sup>3</sup> ऋग्वेदवादात् साध्वी स्त्री न भवेदात्मघातिनी ॥ \*

<sup>4</sup> आश्वलायणी, सांख्यायनी, शाकला, वाष्कला, माण्डुक्यी

Mantras Udīrshwa, &c., raise, holding her by the hand and saluting her ; but if she have sufficient courage, she bidding adieu to her friends, relatives, and children, and contemplating the Vishnu-like form of her husband, enters the fire.

\* "The loyal wife (who burns herself) shall not be deemed a suicide."

in the different Vedas, in various Sákhas of the same Veda, and sometimes in different places of the same Sákha of a Veda. The objection to the use of the epithets "Avidhavá" and "Sapatni," whereby you suppose the reason for burning to be wanting, can be easily answered by supposing the Sati (whose soul is, as it were, wedded to that of her husband), not to be widowed; actual practice, when it prevailed in India, may be considered as confirmatory of this opinion. The Sati, in making preparations for ascending the funeral pile, used to mark her forehead with Sindura, and to deck herself sumptuously with all the symbols of a Sadhavá.

But so long as the proper place of the verse quoted by Raghunandana, is not pointed out, the occidental pandits, who are making wonderful progress in Vaidic learning, may regard it an idle assertion, I shall therefore, for argument's sake, grant Raghunandana's citation to be a false reading of the seventh verse in question.

On this supposition you may be justified in coming to the conclusion, that the genuine reading of the passage rather discountenances than enjoins Sahamarana; but by referring to the subjoined Sútras<sup>1</sup> of Bharadwája and Aswaláyana, wherein they specify the rites in

---

<sup>1</sup> नवम्यां व्युष्टायां यज्ञोपवीतीत्यन्तरायामं श्मशानं चाग्निमु  
पसमाधाय संपरिस्तीर्यापरेणाग्निं लोहितं चर्मानुडुहं प्राचीन  
ग्रीवमुत्तरलोमास्तीर्य वेतसमानिनो ज्ञातीनारोहत्योरोहते  
त्यथैनाननु पूर्वान् कम्पयति यथाहानीति प्रतिलोमकृतया  
चारण्या स्त्रुचा द्वे चतुर्गृहीते जुहोति न हि ते अग्ने तनुव  
इति दश च स्त्रुवाहुतीरअपनश्शो शुचदधमिति हुत्वापाश्यां  
सम्पातयत्यत्रोभयं प्रहरति येन जुहोत्यपरेनाग्निं लोहितो  
ऽनङ्गान् प्राङ् मुखोवस्थितो भवति तं ज्ञातयो ऽन्वारभन्ते  
ऽनङ्गाहमन्वारभामह इति प्राञ्ची ऽञ्चन्तीमे जीवा इति जघन्यो  
वेतसशाखया अवकाभिश्च पदानित्यलोभयते मृत्योः पदमि  
त्यथैभ्यो ऽध्वर्युर्दक्षिणतो ऽश्मानं परिधिं दधाति इमं जीवेभ्यः  
परिधिं दधामीति स्त्रीणामञ्चनिषु संपातानवनयतीमानारी  
रिति तैर्मुखानि मृजन्ते यदाञ्जनं चैककुदमिति चैककुदे

which many of the verses of the tenth Mandala quoted by you, are to be respectively cited as Mantras, you will at once see what you rightly guess—that the verse in question has nothing to do with the concremation of a Sati ; it is directed to be chaunted on the tenth day after the burning of the dead, when the relatives of the deceased assemble on the Smasana to perform certain ceremonies, on the conclusion of which, the Adhwaryu takes butter with a new blade of kusa grass, or clarified butter between the thumb and ring finger, and applying it, as collyrium, to the eyes of Sadhavás, 'recites the seventh hymn in question, the moment they are directed to depart towards the east.

Now, as the text, which has been supposed to authorize Sahamarana, clearly appears to be appropriated to quite a different occasion, the argument based upon its interpretation proving it to discountenance concremation, necessarily falls to the ground.

The succeeding verses (to wit, the eighth and ninth), as I observed before, are enjoined to be addressed to the widow, lying on the funeral pile of her husband, and therefore have no relation with the seventh.

Had there been no explicit Vaidic injunction for Sahamarana, these passages, taken by themselves, would certainly have justified the conclusion that the Rigveda prohibits or ignores, by these texts, the

नांजनेनांक्ते यदि त्रैककुदं नावगच्छेत् येनैव केनचिदाञ्जनेना  
ञ्जीरन् ॥ Bharadwája's Súra, Prasna 1, Khanda II.

उत्तरस्मादथाग्निमुपसमाधाय पश्चादस्थानडुहं चर्मास्तीर्य्य  
प्राङ् ग्रीवमुत्तरलोम तस्त्रिन्नमात्यादीनारोहयेदारोहतायुर्ज  
रसंवृणाना इति इमं जीवेभ्यः परिधिं दधामीति परिधिं  
दध्यादन्तर्मृत्युं दधतां पर्वतेनित्यस्नानमुत्तरतो ऽग्नेः कृत्वा परं  
मृत्यो अनुरेहि पन्थामित्यादि चतसृभिः प्रत्यूचं हुत्वा यथा  
हान्यनुपूर्वं भवन्तीत्यमात्यादीनीचेत। युवतयः पृथक्  
पाणिभ्यां दर्भतरणकैर्नवनीतेनांगुष्ठोपकनिष्ठिकाभ्यामाज्येना  
क्षिणी आञ्ज्य पराच्यो विसृजेयुरिमा नारीरविधवाः सुपत्नी  
रिति अञ्जना ईचेत। अश्वत्थीरघिते संरभय्यमिति ॥ Aswalá-  
yana's Grihya Súra, Adhyaya III.

self-immolation of a Sati, but when we find in the Aukhya Sákshá of the Taittiríya Sanhitá, the Sati's address to Agni while throwing herself into it, and thus discover the Vaidic sanction for concremation, we must pause before we regard the eighth verse as an authority against this tragic act.

The Mimánsákára would argue thus,—“Where there are two authorities of a contradictory character, but of equal cogency, an alternative must be supposed to have been allowed<sup>1</sup>.” The Sutrakáras, upon the Vaidic authorities above set forth, direct that the widow as well as the sacrificial utensils of the deceased Brahmana should be placed upon his funeral pile; but, as the widow has a will of her own, she cannot be disposed of like the inert utensils. The Rigveda therefore gives her the option of sacrificing herself or not, according as she may or may not have her courage “screwed up to the sticking place.”

When the Sati lies on the funeral pile, it is presumed<sup>2</sup> she is inclined to immolate herself, and the eighth verse is addressed to her, as the author of the Sahamaranavidhi explains, only to test her resolution, and to induce her to retire, if she be not sufficiently firm in her purpose. The necessity of giving her this option and trying her fortitude beforehand, appears the more strong, when we find it declared<sup>3</sup> that the Sati who becomes Chitabhrashtá, who retires from the funeral pile after the conclusion of the rites, commits a highly sinful act, although it admits of expiation by the performance of the Prájápatya.

Our personal observation of the actual practice when it prevailed in British India confirms this view; from the moment a Sati expressed her desire to follow her lord, up to the time she ascended the funeral pile, every persuasive language was used to induce her to continue in the family, and to discharge her proper duties there, and it was not until she was found inflexible that she was allowed to sacrifice herself, this was perfectly in keeping with the Udírshwa, &c., Mantra.

Thus the 8th verse of the Rigveda, above alluded to, appears to

### <sup>1</sup> तुल्यबलविरोधे विकल्पः ।

Gotama quoted by Kullukabhata in his Com. on Manu, v. 14, B. 2, which see

<sup>2</sup> Sáyana, when he says, in his Commentary on the 8th Rich; “Yasmát anusarana nischayam ákárshih tasmádágachchha,” he takes the same view; he does not consider the burning as delayed, as may be supposed from a technical interpretation of the word “anusarana,” because, as you say, subsequent burning is inconsistent with the presence of the corpse.

<sup>3</sup> चिताभ्रष्टा तु या नारी मोहाद्विचलिता भवेत् ।  
प्राजापत्येन शुद्धोत् तु तस्माद्विपापकर्म्मणः ॥

be, in fact, a Sahamarana Mantra, though its interpretation, apart from other considerations, may, on a first view, seem to discountenance the practice.

A very strong presumption in support of the opinion, that Sahamarana rests upon Vaidic authority, arises from the circumstance of its having prevailed in India in very remote times, when Vaidic rites only were in vogue. On referring to the Mahábhárata, for instance, we find the widows of the heroes slain in the battle of Kurukshetra consuming themselves in the funeral fires of their husbands, when there lived great kings and sages imbued with Vaidic learning, and devoted to the observance of Vaidic rituals.

Nearly two thousand years ago Propertius describes the prevalence of this custom in India, in a passage of which the following is a translation by Boyse (see Brit. Poets, Chalmer's Ed., Vol. 14, p. 563) :—

“ Happy the laws that in those climes obtain,  
Where the bright morning reddens all the main,  
There, whenso'er the happy husband dies,  
And on the funeral couch extended lies,  
His faithful wives around the scene appear,  
With pompous dress and a triumphant air ;  
For partnership in death, ambitious strive,  
And dread the shameful fortune to survive !  
Adorned with flowers the lovely victims stand,  
With smiles ascend the pile, and light the brand !  
Grasp their dear partners with unaltered faith,  
And yield exulting to the fragrant death.”

Cicero, also, who lived about the same time, mentions this fact in his Tusculum Questions. Herodotus speaks of a race of Thracians, whose women sacrificed themselves on the tombs of their husbands : these people, as well as the Getæ by whom this custom was also observed, were perhaps some tribe of degraded Kshetriyas.

You may, if you think it worth while, read this paper at the next meeting of the Royal Asiatic Society.

I remain,

My dear Dr. Wilson,

Yours sincerely,

RADHAKANT DEB.

CALCUTTA, 30th June, 1858.

---

*Observations.*

In disproving the genuineness of the citation of the passage which had been quoted as authority for the Sati, I confined my objections to the particular passage in question, and in this respect the Raja is obliged to admit, that I may be justified in coming to the conclusion, that the genuine reading rather discountenances than enjoins Sati. This was all I maintained. Of course I never intended to deny, that there were numerous texts in the Sūtras and law-books, by which it was enjoined. I restricted my argument to the individual text quoted from the Rigveda, and with Raja Radhakant Deb's own concurrence, I have no occasion to modify the view I have taken, as limited to this object: the text of the Rigveda, that has been quoted as authority for the burning of the widow, is no such thing, "it rather discountenances than enjoined the practice." I have not expressed any opinion, whether any such injunction is to be found in any other part of the Sanhitá of the Rigveda, or of the Sanhitás of the White or Black Yajush, or the Sámaveda. That is quite a different question, although, as the topic is started by the Raja, I may venture to intimate an opinion, that the burning of a widow will not be found even alluded to in the genuine text, the Sanhitá, of either of the three principal Vedas. Whatever may be the antiquity of the rite, and that it is of long standing is not to be disputed, I suspect its origin is later than the Sanhitá, or primary Vedic period. I have now translated, although not yet published, nearly the whole of the Sūktas, or hymns, the primitive portions of the Rigveda, and have yet found no notice of any such ceremony: the prohibition which would imply the existence of the rite, is matter of inference only; the direction, that the widow is to be led away from the proximity of her deceased husband, does not necessarily imply that she was to depart from his funeral pile, and there is no term, in the text, that indicates such a position.

In the course of my translation of the Rigveda, I have had a great number of occasions to refer to the printed texts of the Vájasaneyí Sanhitá, of the Yajur-veda, published by Professor Weber, of the Sámaveda printed by the late Mr. Stevenson and Professor Benfey, and I do not remember to have met with any allusion whatever in either of those works to the Sati ceremonial. There remains therefore only the Taittiriya Sanhitá of the Black Yajush to be examined: a part only of this has been printed by the Asiatic Society of Bengal, in their Bibliotheca Indica, and, as far as it goes, the same absence of allusion to the Sati occurs: so far, therefore, I have reason to believe,

that the burning of widows was unknown to the Vedic period of Hindu ritual or belief.

That the Sūtras of Aswalayāna, Bharadwāja, and other Sūtrākāras contain Sūtras, or rules, for the cremation, is indisputable, but all Vedic scholars agree in considering these works as of much more recent date than the Sanhitā, or text period; they, therefore, prove nothing, and of still less weight are the Sahamarana-vidhi or the Tatwas of Raghunandana, or other equally modern writings: the question is not whether there be any authorities at all for the practice, but whether such authority be discoverable in the original Vedic texts; there is no lack whatever of the former—I cannot yet positively deny, but I question the existence of the latter. To this Radhakant replies, “the most explicit (Vedic) authority is to be found in the two verses of the Aukhya Sākhā of the Taittirīya Sanhitā, quoted in the 84th anuvāka of the Nārāyaṇīya Upanishad,” of which he gives the literal translation as well as of the comment; unfavourably for his argument, the authority is liable to obvious exceptions.

In the first place, the two verses are not cited direct from the text of the Taittirīya Sanhitā itself; they are a quotation of a quotation, and, as in the case of the passage of the Rigveda, which has given rise to this discussion, we know that quotations cannot always be trusted. The Pandits should have made a reference to the Taittirīya Sanhitā itself, and have given us chapter and verse for the passages; we should then be able to test their accuracy by collation with the printed text when complete. In the next place, the quotation occurs in an Upanishad, the Yajnikī, or Nārāyaṇīya: the Upanishad period is of doubtful determination, because the Upanishads, which are numerous, one list enumerating above a hundred, are evidently of widely different dates, and not unfrequently of equivocal character. The Nārāyaṇīya Upanishad is not altogether unexceptionable, for it constitutes the tenth Prapāthaka, or section, of what is usually considered a Brāhmaṇa, the Taittirīya Aranyaka; Śāyana calls it even khilarupā, or of the nature of an additional or supplementary section, so that it is scarcely acknowledged to be a part of the original Aranyaka.

Upon referring to the manuscripts of the library of the India House, another difficulty arises; neither text nor comment consists of more than 64 anuvākas, whilst the verses quoted by Radhakant, are said to be taken from the 84th anuvāka; consequently no such verses could be expected to be found in our copy, and accordingly they do not occur. Śāyana, however, observes, that different recensiors do exist, of which the Drāvīra has 64 anuvākas, the Andhra, 80, the Karnāta 74, others 89. There may be a copy belonging to a different Sākhā,

the Aukhya for instance, of which we have no copy, with 84 anuvákas. Sáyana, however, avowedly follows the Drávira recension, containing only 64 anuvákas, the actual number of two copies consulted, and in which no such passages are met with; whence then do the Pandits derive their scholia of the 84th? it is for them to give a satisfactory explanation. Therefore, as the matter stands, the verses cited, together with their commentary, wear a somewhat suspicious appearance, not the less observable that the different recensions specified are all named after the divisions of *Southern India*, where the Vedas did not penetrate probably till long after their compilation. Although, however, their authenticity be admitted, their occurring in an Upanishad, or even in a Bráhmána, is no proof that the Sanhitá of the Taittiríya Yajush contains them, or sanctions the burning of widows, or that the rite was cotemporary with the ritual of the Vedic period.

H H. W.

---